

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>RICHARD RODRIGUEZ,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:10-CV-0727</b>
	:	
<b>Petitioner</b>	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>B.A. BLEDSOE,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Respondent</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 2nd day of August, 2010, upon consideration of the motion (Doc. 17) for reconsideration, filed by petitioner Richard Rodriguez (“Rodriguez”), wherein Rodriguez avers that he was not served with a copy of the May 7, 2010 report (Doc. 8) of the magistrate judge, which recommended that Rodriguez’s petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied because Rodriguez failed to exhaust his administrative remedies, and it appearing that by order (Doc. 15) dated June 15, 2010, the court adopted the magistrate judge’s report and closed the above-captioned matter, and that Rodriguez’s instant motion (Doc. 17) offers no cognizable justification for his failure to exhaust administrative remedies, and the court finding that there are no manifest errors of law or fact in the challenged order, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotniki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) (“The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence . . . .”); see also Max’s Seafood Café

by Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 17) for reconsideration is DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> On June 18, 2010, Rodriguez filed a motion (Doc. 16) for extension of time within which to file objections to the magistrate judge's report. Five days later, Rodriguez filed his motion (Doc. 17) for reconsideration. In light of the court's order denying the motion (Doc. 17) for reconsideration, Rodriguez's motion (Doc. 16) for extension of time shall also be denied, for his failure to exhaust administrative remedies is dispositive in this matter.